

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Final Office Action mailed on November 28, 2008.

Claims 1, 10, and 17 are amended; claims 21 and 25-34 were previously canceled, without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 1-20 and 22-24 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the claimed amendments may be found throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification page 6 lines 19-23; page 8 lines 3-17; page 12 lines 27-31; *etc.*

Moreover, Applicant believes that the amendments are made for purposes of placing the present application in condition for allowance and that a new search is not necessitated by the amendments. Thus, entry of the amendments is appropriate and Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 1 was objected to due to informalities. It is believed that the amendment made herein to claim 1 obviates said objection.

### **§ 103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiong (U.S. 7,096,490) in view of Gabber (U.S. 5,961,593) and further in view of Selvarajan (U.S. 2002/0032649) and further in view of Rowland (U.S. 6,405,318). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection that each and every element in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

The proposed combination of 4 total references completely lacks any teaching or suggestion of a teaching where identity information is used to impersonate a requestor and is also constructed using a subset of original identity information associated with the requestor. Thus, the rejection of record should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Claims 3-16, 19, 20 and 22-24 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiong in view of Gabber and further in view of Selvarajan and further in view of Rowland and further in view of Gupta (U.S. 6,868,448). Again, obviousness requires that each and every element in the rejected claims be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

Similar to the discussion presented above with reference to the independent claim 1, the proposed combination of 5 total references completely lacks a teaching or suggestion where the temporary identity information is constructed from a subset of original identity information associated with the requestor and where the temporary identity information is used to impersonate the requestor.

Accordingly, the rejections of record with respect to the 5 total references should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Moreover, Applicant reserves the right to later argue on Appeal or otherwise that the usage of 4 and 5 references are not compatible with one another even under the current relaxed rules with respect to obviousness. So, although Applicant has not addressed this issue herein, Applicant reserves the right to later raise such issues in further prosecution associated with this application.

*Reservation of Rights*

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action; however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record is relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

**CONCLUSION**


Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or deficiencies, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(513) 942-0224

Date 01-28-09

By  /  
Joseph P. Mehrle  
Reg. No. 45,535